

Diffusion in disordered systems under iterative measurement

J. C. Flores

Universidad de Tarapacá, Departamento de Física,
Casilla 7-D, Arica-Chile

We consider a sequence of idealized measurements of time-separation Δt onto a discrete one-dimensional disordered system. A connection with Markov chains is found. For a rapid sequence of measurements, a diffusive regime occurs and the diffusion coefficient D is analytically calculated. In a general point of view, this result suggests the possibility to break the Anderson localization due to decoherence effects. Quantum Zeno effect emerges because the diffusion coefficient D vanishes at the limit $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

PACS: 72.15Rn ; 73.23.-b ; 03.65.-w
Accepted in Phys.Rev.B

In this work we study the effect of ideal successive measurements onto a disordered one-dimensional random system. The iterative measurement, separated by intervals of time Δt , are realized on the position observable and they are responsible for a diffusive regime in the approximation $\Delta t b / \hbar \ll 1$. In the general case (i.e. for any Δt) the problem becomes related to a classical Markov chain equations for the probability, not the amplitude. The diffusive regime is related to coherence destruction, operating from the macroscopic measurement apparatus. Since Anderson localization [1-5] operates on coherent systems like Schrödinger equation, we can expect a diffusive behavior for open systems. In fact, for coherent disordered systems, the return-probability at the initial position is nonzero when $t \rightarrow +\infty$ (periodical motion [3,4]) and opposite to the usual nonreversible dynamics behavior expected for open systems.

Explicitly, consider a random one-dimensional tight-binding model with nearest neighbor hopping Hamiltonian (Anderson model),

$$H = \sum_l \xi_l |l\rangle\langle l| + b\{|l\rangle\langle l+1| + |l+1\rangle\langle l|\} \quad (1)$$

where the integer l denotes the lattice position, ξ_l are random independent variables, b is the hopping constant and $|l\rangle$ stands for the discrete position basis. Moreover, the position operator is given by its spectral decomposition

$$Q = a \sum_l l |l\rangle\langle l|. \quad (2)$$

where the length a denotes the period of the lattice. It is well known that the wave function becomes exponentially localized for a disordered system like in equation (1). Moreover, from Landauer formula for the resistance, no conduction is expected [5].

Consider a set of $N + 1$ idealized measures on the observable position Q of the system. The measures are separated by bounded intervals of time Δt_n ($n = 1, 2, \dots, N$); which can be constant, random, or others. Let $\rho(t)$

be the statistical operator describing the disordered system. Using the von Neumann measure scheme [6,7], and since the Hamiltonian H does not commute with the position operator Q , the mapping between two consecutive measures is given by

$$\rho_{n+1}^{(+)} = \sum_l P_l \left(e^{iH\Delta t_n/\hbar} \rho_n^{(+)} e^{-iH\Delta t_n/\hbar} \right) P_l \quad (3)$$

where $\rho_n^{(+)}$ stands for the statistical operator just after the measurement n , and P_l is the corresponding projector operator onto the sub-space spanned by the vector $|l\rangle$. Namely,

$$P_l = |l\rangle\langle l|. \quad (4)$$

In this way, we have a free evolution ($t_n^+ \rightarrow t_{n+1}^-$) carried out with the usual quantum mechanics unitary operator $U = e^{iH\Delta t/\hbar}$. And at the instant t_{n+1} operates the measurement process. After the measurement, the statistical operator becomes diagonal in the representation of the observable [6,7]. Thus, necessarily the density operator can be written as

$$\rho_n^{(+)} = \sum_l W_l^{(n)} P_l \quad (5)$$

where $W_l^{(n)}$ is the probability to find the particle at position l and ‘time’ n . From (3) and (5), the evolution equation for the probability becomes,

$$W_l^{(n+1)} = \sum_s \left\| \langle l | e^{iH\Delta t_n/\hbar} | s \rangle \right\|^2 W_s^{(n)} \quad (6)$$

where, for the transition matrix, each row adds up to unity and $\sum_l W_l^{(n)} = 1$ corresponding to a Markov-chain. Moreover, it corresponds to a doubly stochastic transition matrix i.e. not only the row sums but also the column sums are unity.

For a finite system, i.e. $-L \leq l \leq L$, the unique stationary probability solution is $W_l^{(\infty)} = \frac{1}{2L+1}$ corresponding to an extended state. To show that W^∞ is the unique solution we operate through contradiction: assume other solution G^∞ , then necessarily it is not orthogonal to W^∞ because $\sum_l W_l^\infty G_l^\infty = \frac{1}{2L+1}$. This vector can be decomposed as $G^\infty = \alpha G^\perp + \beta W^\infty$

where α and $\beta \neq 0$ are constants and $G^\perp$ is a vector in the orthogonal space of W^∞ . But since (6) is a linear equation, $G^\perp$ is also a stationary solution, in contradiction with the no existence of orthogonal solutions.

In this way, an iterative measurement process breaks the Anderson localization. The origin of this delocalization is very different to others, related to internal correlations [8-16] or special random distributions [17,18], where the evolution is always represented as a pure state (Schrödinger equation). In our case the measurement process produces mixture and diffusion from decoherence effects.

Calculations can be explicitly made if we consider the approximation of small intervals of time, that is when $\Delta t_n b/\hbar \ll 1$. Using the well known expansion

$$e^{iH\Delta t/\hbar} \rho e^{-iH\Delta t/\hbar} = \rho + i\frac{1}{\hbar} \Delta t [\rho, H] - \frac{1}{2\hbar^2} (\Delta t)^2 [H, [H, \rho]] + O(\Delta t^3), \quad (7)$$

the first order expansion in equation (3), gives us the master evolution equation for the probability

$$W_l^{(n+1)} - W_l^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} (\Delta t_n)^2 \sum_s \|\langle l | H | s \rangle\|^2 (W_s^{(n)} - W_l^{(n)}), \quad (8)$$

namely, quadratic in the expansion parameter. Defining the spatial dispersion in the usual way $\sigma_n^2 = a^2 \sum_l l^2 W_l^{(n)}$. Then, from equation (8) we have the discrete evolution equation

$$\sigma_{n+1}^2 - \sigma_n^2 = \frac{2b^2 a^2}{\hbar^2} (\Delta t_n)^2, \quad (9)$$

and defined only within a small time interval. In this equation, different possibilities must be considered:

(i) If the interval of time between two consecutive measurements is constant ($\Delta t_n = \tau$), the dispersion has a diffusive behavior given by

$$\sigma_n^2 = \frac{2b^2 a^2}{\hbar^2} (\tau)^2 n, \quad (10)$$

where we have assumed the initial dispersion $\sigma_0 = 0$. From equation (10), the diffusion coefficient D is ($t = n\tau$)

$$D = \frac{2b^2 a^2 \tau}{\hbar^2}. \quad (11)$$

(ii) If the intervals Δt_n are random bounded independent quantities. Also a diffusive regime must be expected because the average $\langle \Delta t_n \rangle$ are independent of n . Remark that from (9) the dispersion $\sigma_{n \rightarrow \infty}^2$ becomes Gaussian distributed (central limit theorem).

(iii) The intervals Δt_n are constant and corresponding to N measurement realized in the total interval of time T , namely $\tau = \frac{T}{N}$ in (10) and (11). Here the diffusion coefficient becomes

$$D = \frac{2b^2 a^2 T}{\hbar^2 N} \quad (12)$$

and vanishes in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ (quantum Zeno effect [19]). Namely, at this limit the system remains freezed at the first state after the measurement.

In conclusion we have presented theoretical evidence that idealized iterative measurement break strong localization. This result confirms that decoherence effects produce diffusion in disordered systems. This is a general result related to the absence of a discrete spectrum for open systems. To be more explicit, consider the linear entropy $S(t)$ defined as

$$S = 1 - \text{Tr} \rho^2, \quad (13)$$

then the measurement process increases S irreversibly because $S^{(+)} > S^{(-)}$. The spectrum cannot be discrete, and the particle does not reach its initial position as usually in Anderson localization. In other more general disordered open systems, we can expect the relationship

$$\frac{dS}{dt} > 0 \quad (14)$$

linked to irreversibility. As said before, for disordered systems, the probability of return to the initial position is not zero (periodical motion due to discrete spectrum) and it is incompatible with (14).

Finally we remark that recently it was shown that the ortho-para nuclear spin conversion in CH_3F molecules relaxes having a rate which decreases when the gas pressure is increasing [20]. This is an example of freezing of quantum states induced by collisions, and is an experimental support to the quantum Zeno effect. In our case, the inhibition effect is present in the appropriate limit (12). Nevertheless, the interesting fact here is that in the spin conversion experiment the monitoring is carried out using the surrounding gas. Recently [21] the breaking of the Anderson localization in systems with correlated disorder has been experimentally found using semiconductor superlattices (SL's), by means of optical and transport measurements. Thus we are thinking on suitable SL's, in order to verify the theory of the present work. We are considering ultrafast optical spectroscopy, using femto-second laser pulses, as experimental technique that has been used recently to measure experimentally the Bloch electron displacement as a function of time in SL's [22].

Acknowledge : I thanks Dr. V. Bellani and Dr. E. Diez for its comment about the manuscript and possible experimental realizations on SL's. This work was motivated by discussions at the 'International Workshop On Disordered Systems With Correlated-Disorder' (PELICAN Project, Arica, Sept. 98). A preliminary version of this work was first presented at the Fourth International Andino Meeting of Physics (PELICAN Project, Arica, Oct.98). This work was not supported by FONDECYT.

References

- [1] N. F. Mott and W. D. Twose, Adv.Phys. **10**, 107 (1961).
- [2] K. Ishii, Prog.Theor.Suppl. **53**, 77 (1973).
- [3] F. Delyon, Y. Levi, and B. Souillard, Phys.Rev.Lett. **55**, 618 (1985).
- [4] H. Kunz and B. Souillard, Commun.Math.Phys. **78**, 201 (1980).
- [5] B. U. Felderhof, J. Stat.Phys. **43**, 267 (1986).
- [6] J. von Neumann, Mathematical Foundation Of Quantum Mechanics (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955).
- [7] A. Bohm, Quantum Mechanics : Foundation and Applications (Springer-Verlag, 1986).
- [8] J. C. Flores J.Phys.Condens.Matter **1**, 8471 (1989).
- [9] D. H. Dunlap, H.-L Wu and P. Phillips, Phys.Rev.Lett **65**, 88 (1990).
- [10] A. Bovier, J.Phys.A **25**, 1021 (1992).
- [11] F. Domínguez-Adame, E. Maciá and A. Sánchez, Phys.Rev. B **48**, 6054 (1993).
- [12] E. Diez, A. Sánchez and F. Dominguez-Adame, Phys.Rev.B **50**, 14 359 (1994); **50**, 17 736 (1994).
- [13] S. N. Evangelou and E. N. Economou, J. Phys.A **26**, 2803 (1993).
- [14] J. Heinrichs, Phys.Rev.B **51**, 5699 (1995).
- [15] M. Hilke, J.C. Flores and F. Domínguez-Adame, Phy.Rev.B **58**, 8837 (1998). And references there in.
- [16] F. A. B. F. de Moura and M. L. Lyra, Phys.Rev.Lett. **81**, 3735 (1998).

- [17] M. Hilke and J. C. Flores, Phys.Rev.B **54**, 10 625 (1997) and references there in.
- [18] A. Crisanti, C. Flesia, A. Pasquarello and A. Vulpiani, J.Phys.Condens. Matter **1**, 9509 (1989).
- [19] See for instance: B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J.Math.Phys. **18**, 756 (1977). S. Pascazio and N. Namiki, Phys.Rev.A **50**, 4582 (1994).
- [20] B. Nagels, L. J. F. Hermans and P. L. Chapovsky, Phys.Rev.Lett **79**, 3097 (1997).
- [21] V. Bellani, E. Diez, R. Hey, L. Toni, L. Tarricone, G. B. Parravinci, F. Domínguez-Adame, and R. Gomez-Alcalá, Phys.Rev.Lett. **82**, 2159 (1999).
- [22] K. Leo, Semicond.Sci.Technol.**13**, 249 (1998).